

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00060 121039Z

46

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 OMB-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20 DRC-01

SAM-01 /152 W

----- 124649

R 120800Z JUN 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 0097

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0060

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: JUNE 7, 1974 DISCUS-  
SION WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE

1. BELOW IS TEXT OF U.S. REP'S REPORT ON JUNE 7, 1974  
DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REP AS REPORTED TO AD HOC GROUP.

BEGIN TEXT:

2. BEGIN SUMMARY: AT LATTER'S INVITATION, U.S. REP  
HAD DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REP KHLESTOV ON JUNE 7.  
CONVERSATION CONSISTED OF GENERAL REVIEW, WITH KHLESTOV  
STRESSING SOVIET INSISTENCE ON EQUAL TREATMENT DENYING  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00060 121039Z

ANY HARDENING OF EAST POSITION AND ASSERTING INTEREST

FOR PROGRESS. END SUMMARY.

3. U.S. REP SAID THAT U.S. AND ALLIES WERE DISAPPOINTED AT LACK OF PROGRESS IN ROUND 3 OF THE VIENNA TALKS. HE SAID U.S. AND ALLIES FELT THAT WEST HAD SINCE EASTER RECESS MADE SIGNIFICANT MOVES IN THE FORM OF COMMITMENTS INVOLVING THE WEST EUROPEANS, NAMELY, THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT AND THE REVIEW AND WITHDRAWAL COMMITMENT. HE SAID THAT ALLIED REPS CONSIDERED THEY WERE RESPONDING TO INDICATIONS IN SECOND ROUND FROM SOVIETS THAT UNDER SATISFACTORY CONDITIONS SOVIETS MIGHT AGREE TO A U.S.-SOVIET-ONLY PHASE I. U.S. REP ASKED WHY SOVIET POSITION HAD HARDENED SINCE RECESS.

4. KHLESTOV DENIED SOVIET'S POSITION HAD HARDENED OR CHANGED, ASSERTING THAT SOVIETS HAD ALWAYS RIGOROUSLY ADHERED TO REQUIREMENT THAT ALL 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS REDUCE FROM OUTSET.

5. U.S. REP SAID THAT U.S. AND ALLIES WERE DISAPPOINTED THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO CHANGE IN SOVIET'S POSITION IN RESPONSE TO THE POST-RECESS MOVES MADE BY THE WEST AND ASKED WHETHER SOVIETS WERE WAITING FOR OUTCOME OF CSCE OR SOME OTHER EVENT SUCH AS THE SUMMIT.

6. KHLESTOV SAID THAT SOVIETS WERE NOT WAITING FOR ANY EXTERNAL EVENT AND ASSERTED THAT THEY WISHED TO MAKE PROGRESS IN BOTH CSCE AND MBFR. U.S. REP SAID THAT WESTERN ACTIONS HAD TO BE BASED ON ACTUAL MOVES MADE BY THE EAST RATHER THAN ON ITS PROFESSIONS OF INTEREST IN PROGRESS AND THAT THE WEST HAD SEEN NO EASTERN MOVEMENT SINCE EASTER.

7. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT THE NON-INCREASE SUGGESTION WAS NOT A SIGNIFICANT MOVE IN VIEW OF FACT THAT NO WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS PLANNED ANY INCREASE IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AND THAT THOSE INCREASES WHICH WERE PROGRAMMED, NAMELY, THOSE IN TANKS AND OTHER EQUIPMENT WOULD NOT BE PREVENTED BY THE NON-INCREASE PROVISION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00060 121039Z

8. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE SOVIETS DID NOT HAVE MUCH INTEREST IN THE REVIEW SUGGESTION, INCLUDING THE WITHDRAWAL POSSIBILITY, INASMUCH AS IN THEIR OPINION THIS WAS TOO DRASTIC A REMEDY FOR A SITUATION WHERE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS WERE DRAGGING ON WITHOUT RESULT.

9. KHLESTOV SAID THAT MOSCOW INSISTED THAT THERE BE

EQUALITY OF LIMITATIONS ACCEPTED BY EAST AND WEST. HE ASSERTED THAT THE WESTERN PROPOSAL WAS UNEQUAL IN THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD ACCEPT A PERMANENT CEILING ON FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA AT A REDUCED LEVEL WHEREAS THE WEST EUROPEANS WOULD MERELY UNDERTAKE A GROUND FORCE MANPOWER LIMITATION AT THE CURRENT LEVEL AND FOR A LIMITED PERIOD.

10. U.S. REP POINTED OUT THAT THE EAST WAS DEMANDING A SIGNIFICANTLY MORE SERIOUS COMMITMENT FROM THOSE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS WHOSE FORCES AND TERRITORY WERE ENTIRELY WITHIN THE REDUCTION AREA, THAN THE COMMITMENT TO BE ACCEPTED BY THE SOVIETS AND THE U.S. KHLESTOV SAID THAT HE REALIZED THAT THE U.S. AND ITS ALLIES GENUINELY BELIEVED THAT THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE. HOWEVER HE ARGUED THAT ALL THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS HAD BY SIGNING THE COMMUNIQUE UNDERTAKEN TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES IN THE AREA AND HAD ACCORDINGLY UNDERTAKEN THE CONSEQUENCES OF SUCH REDUCTION WHICH WOULD, OF COURSE, BE DIFFERENT FOR THOSE COUNTRIES WHOSE FORCES AND TERRITORIES WERE LOCATED SOLELY WITHIN THE REDUCTION AREA. U.S. REP REPLIED THAT THE WEST HAD RECOGNIZED THE SECOND PHASE WOULD INVOLVE WEST EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS BUT THAT THE MERE SIGNING OF THE COMMUNIQUE DID NOT MEAN THAT THEY WOULD REDUCE FROM THE OUTSET, PARTICULARLY IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT THE EFFECT OF REDUCTIONS WOULD BE UNEQUAL.

11. KHLESTOV THEN ASKED WHY THE U.K. AND CANADA SHOULD NOT BE TREATED THE SAME AS THE U.S. U.S. REP REPLIED WITH THE USUAL ARGUMENTS. KHLESTOV SAID THAT HE COULD NOT SEE THE DISTINCTION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00060 121039Z

12. KHLESTOV SAID THAT HE REALIZED THAT EACH SIDE HAD ITS OWN POSITION AND WOULD NOT ACCEPT THE POSITION OF THE OTHER SIDE. ACCORDINGLY A COMPROMISE WOULD BE NECESSARY. BOTH SIDES MUST SEEK MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS. U.S. REP SAID THAT WEST HAD TRIED WITH ITS MOVES TO FIND SUCH A SOLUTION BUT EAST HAD MADE NO COMPARABLE MOVE.

END TEXT.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** ALLIANCE, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, MEETING DELEGATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 12 JUN 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974MBFRV00060  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D740151-0552  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740653/aaaabsyq.tel  
**Line Count:** 162  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 20 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <08 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: JUNE 7, 1974 DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE  
**TAGS:** PARM, US, UR, XT, NATO, (KHLESTOV)  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005